

Reply to Comment on "Superradiant Phase Transitions and the Standard Description of Circuit QED"

Oliver Viehmann,¹ Jan von Delft,¹ and Florian Marquardt²

¹*Physics Department, Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics, and Center for NanoScience, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Theresienstraße 37, 80333 München, Germany and*

²*Institut für Theoretical Physics, Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Staudtstraße 7, 91058 Erlangen, Germany*

In their recent comment [1] on our letter [2], Ciuti and Nataf (CN) question our conclusion that a super-radiant phase transition (SPT) [3] does not occur in a well-defined model of a circuit QED system with charge-based artificial atoms. We think that their critique is not justified. In the following, we briefly review and address the arguments of CN.

i) In [2], we develop a microscopic description of circuit QED systems from first principles. This allows us to apply a no-go theorem for SPTs known from cavity QED [4] to circuit QED. CN do not see a link between our microscopic description of the system and the effective degrees of freedom in the standard description [5] (which permits a SPT [6]). First, they seem to indicate that only the latter are involved in a possible SPT and that the no-go theorem which makes use of the former and the Thomas-Reiche-Kuhn sum rule (TRK) does not put constraints on them. Second, they argue that if the effective degrees of freedom were affected by the no-go theorem, we should specify how this modifies the standard circuit QED Hamiltonian.

The physical phenomenon of the SPT (spontaneous transverse electromagnetic field, macroscopic occupation of excited atomic states) is independent of the description of the circuit QED system. In general, every correct description must agree on the physical phenomena to be observed. While the standard description of circuit QED characterizes an artificial atom by its usual effective degree of freedom (charge and phase) and the microscopic description by the state of all electrons and nuclei constituting the artificial atom, both descriptions still have to agree on the possibility of a SPT. Our crucial message has been that the microscopic description is (of course) more reliable than the effective description, which may be suitable for some cases and fail in others. In particular, as the effective description contradicts the microscopic description concerning SPTs, it fails for circuit QED systems with many artificial atoms. Here and elsewhere in physics, the burden of proof is on any effective description to be consistent in its predictions with microscopic theory. As to the second part of CN's argument i), we clearly state in [2] that for given coupling and atomic level spacing, the coefficient of the term $\propto (a^\dagger + a)^2$ in the standard Hamiltonian is too small to be compatible with the TRK. We also discuss how such a deficiency may

arise when going to an effective model.

ii) Our microscopic description of a circuit QED system presumes that an artificial atom is a closed box with a fixed number of microscopic constituents. CN do not agree with this assumption. According to them, artificial atoms of the Cooper-pair box type consist only of the small superconducting island (and not of the bigger island, which is often called reservoir), and on this small island the number of electrons is not conserved.

We consider the whole of all superconducting islands and Josephson junctions of an artificial atom as a closed box with fixed particle number. This is in full agreement with current experiments. However, we do not assume particle number conservation on one of the islands of an artificial atom. Cooper pair tunnelling between different metallic islands and linear superpositions of number states are hence clearly included in our description. We note that even for the early circuit QED experiments with Cooper-pair box artificial atoms whose larger islands can partly overlap with the transmission line resonator, marginal exchange of electrons with the resonator is not expected to influence the tendency of the system towards a SPT.

iii) At the end of our paper, we generalize the no-go theorem for SPTs to cases where higher excited atomic levels also have to be considered, thereby ascertaining that they do not enable a SPT. One step in our proof of the generalized no-go theorem is to perturbatively show that transitions among excited states of the (artificial) atoms are not significant for the possibility of a SPT. In their comment, CN construct a model system which they claim to constitute a counterexample. They claim that in this model the perturbation expansion fails since the model undergoes a first order phase transition (rather than the usual second order SPT).

However, the standard scenario considered for the SPT is the following: The system is sent to the thermodynamic limit, $N, V \rightarrow \infty$, at constant fixed density N/V and fixed atomic parameters (transition frequencies Ω_{ij} and dipole matrix elements d_{ij}). In this limit, the perturbation of atomic levels induced by the cavity goes to zero, as $d_{ij}^2/V \rightarrow 0$ (even though the coupling $\lambda_{ij} \propto \Omega_{ij} d_{ij} \sqrt{N/V}$ is finite). Thus, the scenario described by CN, where this correction becomes larger than the transition frequencies, does not apply. The atoms remain in the ground state with a probability approaching

unity, so that our perturbation expansion is justified.

Therefore, for a model with one bosonic mode coupled to multi-level atoms, we have ruled out the SPT. In particular, our argument rules out this transition in a circuit QED system, contrary to the predictions of [6]. Of course, our proof does not apply to (and was not intended for) other models, such as one with two independent bosonic modes showing a phase transition [7]. However, the possibility of having phase transitions in other specially constructed models does not impact the conclusions of our letter. In addition, we emphasize that all such models must be checked to be compatible with

the TRK sum rule.

-
- [1] C. Ciuti and P. Nataf, arXiv:1112.0986v1 (unpublished).
 - [2] O. Viehmann, J. von Delft, F. Marquardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 113602 (2011).
 - [3] K. Hepp and E. H. Lieb, Ann. Phys. **76**, 360 (1973).
 - [4] K. Rzażewski and K. Wódkiewicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 432 (1975).
 - [5] A. Blais *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 062320 (2004).
 - [6] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, Nature Commun. **1**, 72 (2010).
 - [7] M. Hayn, C. Emary, and T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 053856 (2011).